RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 13 2006

Patent applicant:
Christopher Van Michaels,
aka Van Michaels C.
(Physicist, Geophysicist &
Industrial Chemist)
818 N. STONEMAN Ave; #1
ALHAMBRA, CA 91801-1415
(Address In Bulgaria: Bulv.
PATRIARCH EFTIMIY No 36,
entrance 2, app.17;
BULGARIA, SOFIA 1000.
Tel. 011-359-2-986-5074
e mail: vanmichaels @ operamail. com

Pat. Application No 10/620,870; Filing Date: 07/15/2003
Art Unit 3673
Pr. Examiner: JOHN KRECK

To the my primary Patent Examiner John KRECK, and to whom it may concern

FAX No: 001-571-273-8300

Summary of the Telephone Interview with Primary Examiner John Kreck, held on Dec. 29-2005, as Required by MPEP §714.04 & 37CFR §1.133 (b)

Dear Mr J. Kreck,

As you last advised me, the following is the required by the U.S. Patent Law (from the Patent Applicant -C. Van Michaels in this particular case) Summarized Telephone Interview with you, held on Dec. 29, 2005 when you reached me for that at my Sofia, Bulgaria telephone No 011-359-2-986-5074. To my best recollection, You first informed me that You already received my 'PETITION TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT BASED ON FAILURE TO RECEIVE OFFICE ACTION', which you sent to another office for resolution, which I appreciate. In the mean time I have been informed that it will takes 2 to 3 weeks to get the resolution, then, you will restart the examination of my invention.

NATURALLY, I profited the occasion to ask you about the content of your 'Office Paper' from 11 April 2005 which I never received but, right or wrong, were very thrifty about informing me concerning its content. In my opinion that was not bad news for me.

* * * TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN * * *

I).. So far, continuing to ask my Patent Examiner about the same matter, he told me that he examined not my LEGALLY, PROPERLY and TIMELY AMENDED NEW CLAIMS 14 through CLAIM 26 (notwithstanding that he had them timely) but, my old claims 1 to 13.

In my opinion such examination is wrong and I object it for it prevents the clarity of my invention. LAW IS LAW and it should not disadvantage the diligent patent applicants.

By the way, my new claims were requested by an Paper of MAIL STOP MISSING PARTS OFFICE, of the Commissioner of Patents, dated 10-21-2003 and were sent to that Patent Office long time before hiring examiner John KECK to handle my case. My AMENDED CLAIMS 14 THROUGH 26 are claiming the same invention of of my old claims 1 through 13 but, more clearly. I did the amendment to correct, Sua Sponte, the several spelling, typing and syntax's errors committed by hurrying to mail my invention to the Patent Office. Any Patent Applicant is allowed such AMENDMENTS BEFORE ACTUALLY STARTING THE EXAMINATION by the P. OFFICE. Therefore, I beg examiner John Kreck to disregard my Claims 1 to 13 and examines my AMENDED CLAIMS 14 trough 26 making the invention much more clear and correct.

II). During same Telephone Interview, examiner J.KRECK expressed an opinion that my (CANCELED, hence wromg) INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1 is too long and that I shall minimize it to about 2 pages and to limit it to one only processes of my, to become more clear and understandable. I realized before Mr. Kreck that my CLAIM 1 needs AMENDMENT and that is why I amended it as my new claim 14, hence, I believe that should Mr. Kreck had examined my TRUE CLAIM 14, he would have no problem of understanding it.

NATURALLY objected the OPINION of the examiner for DIVISION, limiting my CLAIM 14 to ONE PROCESS ONLY, for that tantamount to PATENT OFFICE'S DESIRE to DISTRICT MY INVENTION which is for a legal 'PROCESS OF PROCESSES'. There is no way to make a 'Process of Processes' containing one process only. It is not difficult to see that my CLAM 14 STANDS FOR A LEGAL "PROCESS OF PROCESSES" where said processes are PHYSICALLY and LEGALLY ENTANGLED into one invention. The United States (and any other country's) Patent Law specifically legislated that a Patent Application for a NEW 'PROCESS OF PROCESSES' ONE INVENTION.

Therefore, an office requirement for DIVISION of invention consisting of a PROCESS OF PROCESSES is simply illegal for that reveal a desire for DESTRUCTION. The individual processes of a 'Process of Processes' (like my one) are physically, logically and mutually so entangled, that when even one only of them is removed, the rest of them cannot perform task(s) of the invention. In my particular case my invention has the noble task "....FOR MANUFACTURING NON CARCINOGENOUS ZERO POLLUTING ECO FUELS FROM GAS HYDRATES, NOT EXHAUSTING EVEN CO_2 TO FACE THE CANCER AND THE MENACING GREEN HOUSE EFFECT". Should my invention is destroyed, the lost for the USA would be:

(1) DESTROYING the only promising technology allowing profit from a worldwide

LARGEST new source of enery, such as the GAS HYDRATES (aka METHANE HYDRATES). That is for, in the last 15 years, the geophysicists discovered worldwide enormous deposits of METHANE HYDRATE, but, (apart the technology described in my patent specification and claims) no country in the world has yet a practical technology for mining & using them. [The METHANE HYDRATES are a deep see phenomenon of ice like looking blocks of matter, yielding vast quantity of METHANE (Natural gas) on its decomposition],

(2) LOST describing inexpensive new source of QUIETED HYDROGEN which should be the preferred fuel of the near future. Presently the most economical way for deriving Hydrogen is reforming the natural gas into synthesis gas (a blend of H_2, CO_2, CO and N_2) followed by the SHIT REACTION, to further increase the hydrogen in the synthesis gas, by reacting it with steam at about 500°C in the presence of manganese as catalyst.

That process is however expensive for is by-producing a lot of the unneeded CO_2 and synthetic water (from unavoidable partial oxidation of the H_2 to H_2O) which makes the process still expensive (less than 30% efficiency of conversion). That low efficiency can be avoided only by burning the natural gas (same like the Methane CH_4 of the gas hydrates) into the burning chamber of a BEZENTROPIC POWER PLANT (of this invention) capable to convert the heath to work by an efficiency of 90% (and more when said turbine is converted to closed circuit FREON TYPE BEZENTROPIC TURBINE as another part of my PROCESS OF PROCESSES); then using its low cost electricity to derive the needed hydrogen by the very efficient step of electrolysis of the water, yielding also valuable by--produced oxygen;

(3) lost from the valuable ACETAL FUELS of the invention which also cannot be inexpensively produced without my invention.

(4) Lost from destroying the faculty of enormous ENERGY SAVINGS, employing my way of BEZENTROPIC HEATH to WORK CONVERSION, stemming from my DISCOVERY OF SPONTANEOUS STIMULATED MOLECULAR ORDER FROM THE MOLECULAR DISORDER OF THE GASES and/or STEAM, obtainable either through NATURAL or ARTIFICIAL STIMULATION by suitable STIMULATORS as I described them in details in my patent specification and CLAIMS 14 through 26...

I short named that law the 'LAW OF THE BEZENTROPY' and also: 'THE LAW OF LIFE' since all living beings exists actually avoiding the ENTROPY thanks to said LAW OF ORDER.

As a matter of fact life is simply impossible without my law of the BEZENTROPY BECAUSE, to convert the heat to work and to electricity, to move and to perform work the law of ENTOPY (aka the Second Law of the thermodynamics) is always requiring to have a TEMPERATURE GRADIENT but, as is well known no living being has that at the cellular level

of its cells and mitohondria (little bodies within the cells), where namely the heath (derived from the food) is actually converted to work and to bioelectricity.

The LAW OF ENTROPY is therefore PROHIBITING all life in the world and particularly my, Mr Krecks and that of all patent examiners of the USPTO, but, we still exists. notwithstanding that none of as had ever TEMPERATURE GRADIENT.

"COGITO ERGO SUM" (I thing, therefore I exist) stated RENÈ DESCART more than 400 years ago. I do my freedom now to supplementing that logical statement by saying: I WORK, therefore, I exists without temperature gradient, TRAVERSING the LAW of ENRTOPY, since my existence is allowed by the more powerful LAW OF THE BEZENTROPY, creating biological order in every cell of my.(The prefix BEZ in Bulgarian –and in all other Slavic languages- means 'WITHOUT' from where I derived the new scientific word BEZENTROPY)

THEREFOR, should some patent examiner deny my UNIVERSAL LAW of ORDER in the UNIVERSE (aka the 'Law of Bezentropy In the world') that would be intellectual SUICIDAL for that is denying 'per se' of his own existence, thus, burning the credit of his examining expertise, and making his office paper VOID. Of course I have also a detailed physico-biological explanation showing how exactly the LAW OF BEZENTROPY traversees the ENTROPY (in every living cell) to create the life, but, that particular theoretical matter is not part of this invention; hense, I plan to publish it in some scientific journal.

What particularly matters this invention and its prodigious LAW OF THE BEZENTROPY, are all bezentropic turbines and devises, ALLOWING NEW SOURCE OF ENERGY, UNUSUAL EFFICIENCY IN HEAT TO WORK and to ELECTRICITY CONVERSION, NON -CARCINOGENOUS ECO FUELS of ZERO POLLUTION, all helping to develop the METHANE HYDRATE, as an (practically) endless new source of energy, described and claimed, in details, of my patent specification termed 'CLEAN PROCESS OF PROCESSES FOR MANUFACTURING NON CARCINOGENOUS ZERO POLLUTING ECO FUELS FROM GAS HYDRATES, NOT EXHAUSTING EVEN CO_2 TO FACE THE CANCER AND THE MENACING GREEN HOUSE EFFECT'.

Once again it is a legal and logical invention of a 'PROCESS OF PROCESSES' and not invention for one only process or device, for no single process can perform the task of the invention.

CONSEQUENTLY the only way to order SUBDIVISION upon this 'PROCESSES of PROCESSES is first to change the very Patent Law to prohibit patenting 'PROCESS OF PROCESSES'.... and that would be end of further revolutionary inventions in the United States. Presently, denying a 'Process of Processes' is simply violation of the patent law.

Another law violation would be (if happened) to DISREGARD of my legally and timely AMENDED CLAIMS 14 TROUGH 26, adopting in lieu of them my legally and timely CANCELED and inferior CLAIMS 1 TO 13 which I do not consider anymore as my invention..

During the same (45 minute long) telephone interview my examiner John Kreck told me that when he will back receive my patent application, he will review it again and that may call me again for another interview. He told me that his University major is MINING and because of that my invention (contains matter of GEOPHYSICS, THEORETICAL PHYSICS, THERMODYNAMICS, INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY ECOLOGY and engineering) is somewhat complicating his examination. My self am graduated PHYSICIST, GEOPHYSICIST and INDUSTRIAL CHEMIST, but, I don't believe that my invention needs new examiner. Not only because it would be difficult to find examiner having all my majors, but, mainly if found, then, my invention would be be again a 'TERA INGOGNITA' for him BECAUSE, EVERYTHING contained in my patent application IS ORIGINAL, NOT EXISTING YET IN THE UNIVERSITY TEXT BOOKS.

On the other hand I believe that any patent examiner ordinarily skilled in the art may learn and appreciate a fully original invention if he really likes to do that. By the way any invention must contain some TERA INCOGNITA to be really new and patentable.

I expressed also my wondering to the examiner why the examination of my invention is so protracted when, in accordance with MPEP Section 708.02, it has been already ruled as SPECIAL (on account of my old age of 82 years) and while I filed also a REQUEST UNDER MPEP Section 707.07 (J) requiring the examiner, when find a Patentable Subject matter in a patent application, but feels that its claims are not entirely suitable, to draft one or more allowable claims for the applicant.

I mentioned to him that my invention is eligible even for additional SPECIAL treatment under MPEP §708.02 for it stands (1) for UNUSUAL SAVING of ENERGY, (2) for the discovery of a really new and large SOURCE OF ENERGY, and (3) for my new ECO FUELS OF ZERO CARCINOGENS AND POLLUTION. Right now the United States need just such kind of inventions, -not inventions for bolts and nuts.

Finally, I am still waiting some good news from my examiner John Kreck concerning the above stated matter and in that hope I, the older colleague of all patent examiners, declaring myself, Sincerely Yours.

DATED on Jan. 12 -2006 in SOFIA, BULGARIA.

Patent applicant:

C. Van Michaels

/C. van Michaels/